97-84171-18

Ellis, Alexander John

The English spelling difficulty and its remedy...

[London]

1870

97-84171-18
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

829.14 Ellis, Alexander John, 1814-1890.
Z The English spelling difficulty and its re[illegible]
v.2 Glossic, considered in a lecture delivered bef[illegible]
the College of preceptors, 6th April, 1870, by
Alexander J. Ellis... [London] 1870.
20, [6] p. 21½ cm in 24 cm.

Contains 6 specimen pages of: Glossic, by Alexander J. Ellis.

Volume of pamphlets

102487

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 10:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 8-28-97 INITIALS: RB

TRACKING # : 26404

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

4214
82-9
No 5

THE ENGLISH SPELLING DIFFICULTY,

AND ITS

REMEDY, GLOSSIC;

CONSIDERED IN

A LECTURE DELIVERED BEFORE THE COLLEGE OF PRECEPTORS, 6TH APRIL, 1870.

BY

ALEXANDER J. ELLIS, F.R.S., F.S.A.,

Fellow of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, Member of the London Mathematical Society. Member of the Council of the Philological Society, formerly Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, B.A. 1857;

Author of "Essentials of Phonetics," "Early English Pronunciation," &c. &c.

1870.

To be had on remitting postage to the Author, 25, Argyll Road, Kensington, W.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. F. HODGSON & SON,
GOUGH SQUARE, FLEET STREET.

THE ENGLISH SPELLING DIFFICULTY

AND ITS REMEDY.

SOME persons deny that there is any Spelling Difficulty at all. They declare that they have felt none themselves; that they cannot recollect having had any difficulty in learning to read, or in teaching their children to read; and never felt any hesitation in writing any word they required to use. To such, the following remarks will necessarily appear entirely useless. But persons with this happy experience certainly form a very small minority. They really exist, and I have personally conversed or corresponded with them; but these communications have not made me change my opinion as to the real merits of the case; and for more than a quarter of a century I have endeavoured to find some means of alleviating the social calamities which seem to flow from the unhappy orthographical form of our language. The remedy which I wish to bring before your notice this evening is in several respects new, and is based upon a consideration which has not yet been discussed. Believing that it may lead to valuable results, and is at least worth a thought, if only as the proposal of so old a worker in the field as myself, I am induced to request the attention of practical educators, and educationalists generally, to my present scheme; and I hope that the discussion on my paper may give me some valuable hints, and may promote a cause which I have ever had deeply at heart.

The following propositions will be generally, if not universally, admitted:—

(1.) Our present Spelling renders learning to Read unnecessarily difficult.
(2.) Our present Spelling renders learning to Write still more difficult than learning to Read.
(3.) Our present Spelling conveys no information to children, to provincials, to ignorant adults, or to foreigners, respecting any received pronunciation of the written words.

We have, say, 90,000 words in our language. Few of us use habitually as many as 10,000 of these. Many do not use as much as 1000. By selecting the 1000 most usual words on the principle of their "numerical value," as explained to you last autumn by Mr. David Nasmyth, (who has struck out a very original idea concerning the precise meaning that should be

attached to such an expression as *usual* in language,) and composing sentences and books from them, we could, without doubt, teach children, on the "Look and Say" system, to read much more rapidly than at present, and to form some conceptions of the general meaning of our orthography. But such conceptions cannot but be very vague and indefinite, and they must be acquired by actually memorising 1000 words; that is, attaching a phonetic value to 1000 different symbols. As long as these 1000 symbols refer to the learner's own language, the difficulty is not so much felt. We should be rather appalled at the notion of learning an alphabet of 1000 characters in a foreign language. Yet this is what it practically amounts to. Still, it can be done, and the difficulty is not so great as it theoretically appears to be. But when we have acquired these 1000 words, we are really not much advanced towards the power of reading correctly any of the remaining 89,000 which we have not heard spoken. This is the point which I wish particularly to impress upon you. The spelling of a word is no guide to its sound. Any rules that can be given are so full of exceptions, that they are practically worthless. They can at most lead us to two or three varieties of sound, out of which we select one, simply by knowing that there is an English word of such a sound. If we have not this knowledge, we can never be certain which we should select. Strange differences of opinion therefore prevail, and may be noted in the great variety of pronunciations given to scientific words, which are frequently used by persons who have never heard others utter them. If it were possible, then, to make the form of a word convey its sound to any one acquainted with a few conventions, reading would be much easier. Now this has been done in Dutch and Spanish. Hence, a language which does not adopt this principle is *unnecessarily* difficult to read.

In the French language the conventional attribution of sounds to specified combinations of letters is so definite, that when the rules are once mastered, even by a foreigner, there is seldom much difficulty (there is often some) in determining what the sound of a word should be, however troublesome he may find the actual utterance. But the converse problem is completely unsolved. There is absolutely no guide but the Academy's dictionary towards the correct or conventional writing of a word heard. Few Frenchmen, except compositors and printer's readers, spell well. Good spelling is not even so prevalent in France as in England. The problem of reading is, therefore, independent of the problem of writing. The first can be solved without any advance having been made towards the second. It is an important part of my scheme that the problems are distinct, and that the latter problem is far more difficult to accomplish than the former. It does not follow that a perfect orthography will render spelling perfectly easy. I have seen very bad spelling from natives both in Italy and Germany, where the orthography is much superior to ours. The difference between reading and writing is much the same as that between hearing and speaking, between passive recipience and active emission. For the millions who can listen to and understand a book, how many are there that can write one?

The general *manuscript* orthography of English, as contained in the mountains of letters which pass through the Post-Office, need not be scanned too closely. How many of the most practised

writers are thoroughly independent of a dictionary? I am not, though I am a constant writer, and have paid great attention to orthography.

The variety of pronunciation prevalent in England, the provincialisms observed even in educated speakers, and still more in the uneducated, cannot be corrected so long as the form of the word conveys no indication of the sound. As a philologist, I have a particular regard for provincialisms, which are important for understanding the history and formation of our language. But as a philanthropist, I recognize the great advantage of a uniform use and pronunciation of our language throughout the British Empire and its colonies, with the great new home of English, the United States. Any means of bringing about so desirable an end is therefore of extreme importance. Our language possesses great attractions for foreigners, and the study of it is on the increase, but the obstacles presented by our orthography are enormous. It is rare—so rare that any individual cases coming under our notice, invariably astonish us—to meet with a foreigner who can read out a page of English so as to be readily intelligible to an audience. He can get on better in speech, because he only uses familiar words and constructions. Reading aloud is the real test.

In addition to the three propositions I have thus illustrated, it would not be difficult to show that our spelling, by wasting time at school over the acquisition of the mere instrument of knowledge, is a great cause of our prevailing ignorance; that so far as it trains the mind of a child at all, it mis-trains, accustoming it to illogical conclusions; that it stands greatly in the way of missionaries, travellers, ethnologists, and philologists; that it obscures the real history of our language, and conceals its present state. But I forbear from entering upon these collateral issues. I must, however, detain you for a few minutes with a consideration of the origin of the extraordinary spelling with which we are at present afflicted. I have recently had to make an elaborate investigation into the relation between writing and pronunciation in England from the earliest times to the present day, and the brief statements which follow are based on this investigation.

(1.) The spelling of our language in the Anglo-Saxon and Early English period was strictly phonetic; that is, the writers endeavoured to represent the sounds of words to the best of their ability, but their instrument was not quite perfect.

(2.) The pronunciation of Early English was very different in different parts of the country, but the value attributed to letters was practically the same down to the middle of the fifteenth century; and hence the orthography was different according to the district of the writer.

(3.) There was, however, one remarkable change in the value of the letters *u* and *ou*, which took place at the latter end of the thirteenth century; and the strictly phonetic feeling which prevailed is shown by the uniformity with which the change of spelling followed this change of value in the letters.

(4.) In the fifteenth century occurred the War of the Roses, during which there was a fusion of provincials, resulting in a great change of our language, both in idiom and pronunciation. It was during this time that a habit arose of disregarding change of pronunciation, and preserving a conventional orthography, inducing

for a time the most perplexing and lawless varieties, as may be seen in the early Caxtons.

(5.) The French words introduced before and during this civil war, and the Latin and Greek words freely used at the revival of learning in the sixteenth century, came to be spelt with a French or Latin orthography, without regard to their English pronunciation at the time.

(6.) Hence, in the early part of the sixteenth century, the phonetic feeling had greatly deteriorated; and the spelling had fallen into such disorder, that it attracted the attention of a series of writers, who endeavoured to reform it. And practically, during the latter half of that century, a reform *was* carried out, though its author is unknown. This consisted in the phonetic distinction of *ee* and *ea*, and of *oo* and *oa*, as now used in *beer, bear, boor, boar*.

(7.) During the seventeenth century, when the Parliamentary wars agitated the country, several absolutely new speech sounds came into vogue, and old ones were lost; but no new letters were at hand, and new uses were therefore assigned to old forms. The confusion had thus become very great, and the writers upon our orthoëpy and orthography had much increased.

(8.) In the meantime, printing had passed, from being a luxury, to being a necessity of life, and printers found it more and more necessary to introduce some degree of uniformity. To this is mainly due the present form of our orthography.

The above considerations will serve to dissipate any notions of sanctity with respect to our present spelling. It is not a hundred years old. Two hundred years ago it presented a very different appearance. Three hundred years ago it was a shapeless mass of confusion. Since the time of Chaucer we have not had a respectable orthography; and our pronunciation has changed so much since his day, that to revert to his spelling would be to dress a man in a boy's clothes. As it exists, our orthography is due, not to any deliberate scheme, not to the conclusions of thoughtful men, not to the knowledge which those who had studied the requisites of orthography could bring to bear upon it, but to the necessities and customs of the printing-office, dealing with a heterogeneous, chaotic mass, which men of letters were incompetent to attack. We may safely say, that no scheme proposed by a man of letters has ever been carried out. The greatest chance of success is in the production of a good, and therefore widely-consulted, dictionary. But we do not now regard Johnson's orthographies, and Webster's are very much disputed.

Still we have an orthography practically uniform, though differences of opinion prevail on about 2000 words enumerated by Worcester. And this orthography is in general use as a medium of communication throughout the immense territory of the English language. The amount of printed matter now produced in a single day is so enormous, that the very thought of interfering with the form of almost every word in every line seems out of the question. Nevertheless such schemes are still more or less agitated. They take various shapes. Some are more or less etymological. The real conception of alphabetic writing has so far died out of men's minds, that some think it of more importance to indicate the history than the sound of a word. For five and twenty years I have endeavoured to discover what is meant by etymological spelling. Notwithstanding my own etymological proclivities, I have been totally unsuccessful. I have not the slightest conception how the history of a word can be conveyed by orthography to one who only sees the word,—how its relation to foreign languages can be conveyed by superfluous or ill-used letters to those who know no foreign language. We write *rhyme*, Milton wrote *rime*. What information does this convey to one who does not know Anglo-Saxon? And he who does, not only does not want the change, but objects to the final *e*. Mitford wrote *iland*. Who knows why, from the mere look of the word? And why put *ck* at the end of *music*, with Johnson? This, at any rate, was not etymologic; but neither does the rejection of the *k* instead of *c* please the Greek scholar, or inform the purely English reader. And the question may be pertinently asked, What would be the advantage of giving the history of a word to every one, even if it were possible? I am, personally, very fond of histories of words; but I cannot recognize their value to the speaker or thinker, who merely wants to know his word and how to use it. The history teaches how it *was* used, and gives an interesting development of thought, not how it *is* used. Since, however, English etymology is very imperfectly understood, there is no danger of such etymological spellings prevailing, and they therefore need not detain us.

Other innovators desire to carry out the apparent motives which brought about our present typographical spelling, and to retrench superfluous letters, or to extend present analogies into new regions. They, however, fear to fail by going too far, and hence limit themselves to two or three, or two or three hundred words. But for this the printing-office pressure is far too strong. Others, however, would carry the analogies further, and affect some thousands of words. Now to this there is a great objection. Such changes have a very doubtful value in themselves. Whether they will facilitate learning to read, is a disputed point; but it is certain that they will not facilitate learning to spell, as the lines of demarcation are still arbitrary, and learners would still have to memorize every word in the language, as at present. The effect on those who can now spell would be most disastrous, if it were possible to require them to change their orthography. The great labour which they have undergone would be practically useless. They would have to unlearn and relearn. Such a thing is not to be imagined. And on this rock alone all partial schemes must split. The printing-house power would also laugh them to scorn.

As I am one of those unfortunate individuals who have tried to introduce a new alphabet with new letters, I may be allowed to say, from my own experience, that there is no present hope of such a scheme succeeding. The expense which attends the provision of new types, and training of new compositors, is enough of itself to stop it. To this we must add the difficulty which old readers would experience in even reading the scheme. The alphabet which I employed, and which some present may recollect to have seen in the "Phonetic News," was not very difficult to decipher, but many found the labour too great. Half-an-hour's work was too much for them to devote to it. The same objection applies, in much greater force, to a printing scheme which involves entirely new characters, though not to a mere shorthand scheme

possessing peculiar advantages to the writer. Hence the most beautiful and philosophic system of writing yet invented, Mr. Melville Bell's Visible Speech, notwithstanding its concomitant system of shorthand, is not adapted for solving the spelling difficulty.

The various contrivances which have been invented for making words in the present spelling tell their own tale, by means of diacritical points, accents, or numbers, are useful to writers of pronouncing dictionaries, and may be more or less adapted for teaching to read. I speak with some hesitation on this point, school experience in their use not having been sufficiently extensive. But they do not in the slightest degree assist in solving the spelling difficulty. Scarcely any one but the inventors themselves are capable of using these ponderous schemes, and they are quite unsuited for the ordinary printing of books. After the recent expositions in this room, I need not mention Messrs. Sonnenschein and Meiklejohn's elaborate scheme for overcoming both the reading and spelling difficulty at once, and without change of spelling or diacrities. I have had no experience with this system, which only appeared a few months ago; but its extremely elaborate nature forms in itself a severe condemnation of our present orthography.

Yet I don't see my way to proposing that any, even the slightest, change should be made in that fantastic spelling. I cannot discover any means whatever for inducing our printers and readers to accept of the slightest supposed improvement in it, nor any authority whatever that they would recognize for enforcing such a change. There is no Academy, as in France or Spain, to print a dictionary and say—Thus only can the literate spell. Government has no department which could superintend such a dictionary, or order its orthography to be used. The Committee of Council on Education has its small band of school inspectors; but their functions are limited to seeing that the present spelling is taught and learned, and does not extend to proposing, examining, or approving innovations; though one of them, the Rev. J. Rice Byrne, in 1868 reported that 10 per cent. failed in writing from dictation, and drew attention to the fact as a result of our ill-conditioned orthography. The Civil Service Commissioners require good spelling in the candidates, but have no power to issue a dictionary containing the only spelling which they will admit as good. Hence I see no hope for the old spelling—nothing to be done with it but to leave it alone, entirely untouched, exposed to the mercy of printer's readers and dictionary makers, to do their best or worst. It is an instrument which has done good service, and will undoubtedly do more; and it is absolutely necessary that all those who wish to consult the treasures of our public libraries should be able to use it. But they must be also able to read the orthography of the eighteenth, seventeenth, sixteenth, fifteenth, fourteenth, and even thirteenth centuries. And they do at present read these orthographies without much trouble, substituting for the real old words their modern equivalents. But who tries to *write* in these orthographies, except for forgery, amusement, or literary work?

Now, this question seems to open out the means of escape. As we read past spellings, but write in the present, why may we not *read* the present, but *write* in a new orthography? Let us see

what are the conditions under which such an arrangement should be possible.

1. The first clearly is, that writers in the present and in the new spelling should be put on a par as far as reading each other's spelling is concerned; or, if there is to be any advantage, it should be easier for a present reader to read the new spelling than for a new reader to read the present spelling. Each must be able to read the spelling of the other with fluency. But as the new speller would have to learn to read in the present spelling under all circumstances, as a branch of his education, and for his own benefit, but the present reader would have to learn to read in the new spelling solely for the advantage of the new speller, to save him from having to write in the present spelling; the present speller should be able to read in the new spelling at least as readily and intuitively as he would now read Shakspere and Spenser in their original editions. If this is not accomplished by the new spelling, nothing will have been accomplished, for the scheme could not possibly come into general use. It would, at best, be a new piece of school-room apparatus, of no social value.

2. This first condition necessitates that no new forms of letters should be introduced, no diacritical signs, nothing which shall make the new spelling unintelligible at first sight to a present reader, and therefore give him the trouble of learning to read—a labour he has good reason to hate. This second condition has, however, an independent value, as we could not otherwise have the new spelling printed without any addition to our stock of types, or written without the necessity of learning new motions of the hand. It is not every English printing-office which possesses in all, or even in several, of its founts of types the diacritical letters necessary for printing French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, German, Danish, or Swedish; still less for Bohemian, Polish, Hungarian, Wallachian, although all based on the Roman alphabet. But every English printing-office must be able to print in the new spelling without preparation, or it would be limited to particular localities, particular printers and publishers, and become at most a philological instrument, of no social value.

3. It must not occupy more space than the present orthography. Although this condition is of much less importance than the two preceding, and may seem hardly worth stating, as some languages, such as German, Dutch, Gaelic, seem to the uninitiated to employ a great superfluity of letters, yet it would be speedily found a weighty objection to a new orthography if it materially exceeded the present spelling in the number of letters necessary for each word. All modern habits tend to shortening words. The labour of writing is already very great, and many writers have not patience to finish their words. Lengthening words considerably is therefore out of the question. Also, if books were actually printed in the new spelling, it would be very objectionable for them to occupy much greater space for the same amount of matter.

These three conditions are independent of any peculiar form which the new spelling may take, when founded upon our present alphabet. But they would not be enough in themselves to justify the recommendation of a new spelling for concurrent use. Any such new spelling must have a special claim on the notice of the public, arising from its fulfilment of conditions which are not

satisfied by our present spelling, but which it is most desirable to satisfy, both on social and scientific grounds. We thus arrive at six additional requirements.

4. The new spelling must show the nature of alphabetic, as distinguished from hieroglyphic or ideographic writing. Now the basis of alphabetic writing is an analysis of the sounds of speech, which are to be strictly represented by symbols either for the ultimate elements or for certain usual combinations of those elements. And the use of alphabetic writing implies an intelligent synthetic manipulation of those symbols, so as to indicate and reproduce the sounds of the language with certainty, when the conventional value of the symbols has been acquired. Briefly, the new spelling must be phonetic. But no attempt should be made at extreme accuracy of analysis, which would occasion difficulties to the teacher and the pupil. There should, however, be a power of attaining considerable accuracy when specially needed.

5. The new spelling must render learning to read books printed in accordance with it, easy, rapid, and pleasant.

6. The new spelling must bear such a relation to the present, that new spellers should be able to read in the present spelling with so much ease, that the total time required for learning to read in both spellings should be considerably less than the time now generally required for learning to read in the present spelling only.

7. The new spelling must be very much easier to use for writing than the present. If the difference in writing, according to the new and the present orthography, be not extremely to the advantage of the new, the whole scheme will be a failure, of no social value.

8. Although the fulfilment of the three first conditions would obviate the necessity for new spellers to learn to write in the present spelling, yet it is obvious that, for a great length of time, prejudice would stand in the way of a young man who could not write in the orthography now prevalent; and hence it would be advisable that the new spelling should not throw any difficulties in the way of acquiring the old, so that those who had learned to read and write in the new spelling only, should not have *greater* difficulty in learning to spell in the present way than is now experienced, and should, if possible, have less, although, from the nature of the case, the difficulty will always be considerable.

9. In addition to the above practical advantages in relation to present spelling, the new spelling should have a special application in settling our orthoëpy; and hence, in promulgating a uniform pronunciation in our provinces, and in facilitating the acquisition of English by foreigners. If this were feasible, other collateral benefits would necessarily ensue—such as the better expression of foreign names and words by English letters for geographical and linguistic purposes, for which a systematic extension of the alphabet would be necessary.

Now, let us suppose that a system of spelling has been found which fulfils all these nine conditions—(1) that it is easy for present spellers to read; (2) that it requires no new letters; (3) that it occupies no more space than at present; (4) that it shews the nature of alphabetic writing; (5) that it renders reading in the new spelling easy; (6) that it makes learning to read in the present spelling more easy than it now is; (7) that it makes

writing in the new way extremely easy, and (8) in the old way not more difficult than at present; and (9) that it has peculiar orthoëpical advantages of its own. Is there any ground for hoping that, at some future and not extremely distant time, its concurrent use should be recognised by competent boards of examiners? Of course, we should only look to the recognition of good new spelling; and this may be readily defined. Good present spelling means spelling according to any dictionary of repute. We cannot limit the definition to any particular dictionary. We cannot render it independent of some dictionary. In the same way, good new spelling will mean spelling according to any pronouncing dictionary of repute, or any received system of pronunciation. We cannot limit it to any one dictionary, or even to a dictionary at all, as there are other orthoëpical standards, and received modes of speech. But by the introduction of such a spelling we might gradually approach more nearly to uniformity of pronunciation.

The precise meaning to be attached to the question is this. Is there any ground for supposing that, at some future and not very distant time, boards of examiners, such as the Civil Service Commissioners, the Society of Arts, the College of Preceptors, the University Middle Class and Degree Examiners, would accept answers written in the new spelling on equal terms with answers written in the present spelling, so that no candidate should be disqualified or rejected for exclusively using the new spelling? This implies a very great deal indeed. In the case of the Civil Service Examiners, it implies that Government Offices would allow letters and abstracts to be written in the new spelling. Judging from the usual rate of progress in Government, this is about the last thing to be expected. But Bishops have doffed their wigs, and so may the Speaker and the Lord Chancellor, when hard pressed. The recognition by the Civil Service Commissioners would, therefore, be the completion of the work. The acceptance of answers, written in the new spelling, at University Degree examinations, might be one of the first. Even at present, if quality of handwriting and orthography told there, as they do in the Civil Service examinations, we might find many extraordinary results. If the Society of Arts and College of Preceptors accepted, it would imply that commercial, professional, and literary men would allow their clerks and managers to use the new orthography conjointly with the old. This is not very likely. It would be always objectionable to mix the orthographies in one book; but some houses might adopt the new spelling entirely, and the custom might spread. Some literary men might also adopt the new spelling entirely. Their printers could always transliterate if desired. There would be no objection in the case of professional men, except in engrossing deeds. Considering the orthoëpical value of the new spelling, boards of examiners, of the kind named, might readily institute a subsidiary examination in the new spelling, as a separate paper on the subject of orthoëpy, which is extremely important, and is much neglected. The School Inspectors, without relaxing their demand for correct spelling in the present way, might acknowledge the new spelling as school apparatus, and insist on its being adopted for that purpose, all pupils being required to learn it as a preliminary stage, on account not only of the facilities which it affords in the mere mechanical art of reading, but also of the

advantages it possesses in correcting pronunciation and improving delivery.

The difficulties of recognition are manifest; and yet there appears to be a ground of hope, if it could be established that the nine conditions previously stated are fulfilled by the new spelling. This hope is founded on the following strictly analogous case, which first led me to the conception of a new spelling running parallel with the present; not crossing or interfering with it in any way, but rather helping than hindering its acquisition, while it offered, at the same time, a much superior instrument, fit for immediate use. To bring out the points of analogy with distinctness, I must ask permission to dwell upon this case at some length.

The ordinary or established system of musical notation was invented for a method of tuning no longer in use, in which sharps and flats were distinct sounds, so that it uses 27 different signs to represent sounds which are now struck by 12 keys on the pianoforte. It is therefore eminently ill-adapted for the present scheme of equal temperament; but it remains in use, and the few attempts made to supersede it, and the corresponding keyboard, have utterly failed. We adopt the same plan with regard to reading from it on the piano that we do in reading from French. We conventionally assign the same sound to two or three symbols; and as there is no doubt as to the proper sound to make, very little difficulty is felt in instrumental music. But theoretical music has been founded so strictly on the older temperament, that the theorists find themselves confused if they do not make distinctions which the pianist ignores; and hence an untaught pianist could not write the sounds he plays without special theoretical instruction, acquired by comparatively few. This notation of practically 27 signs theoretically represents 35, the additional 8 being of no practical value, and seldom used. Some years ago, however, in a paper on the Musical Scale, printed in the Proceedings of the Royal Society, I showed that the correct untempered expression of musical sounds required 72 signs, which I furnished and discriminated by means of two simple additions to the ordinary notation. Now the musical theory which this implied may be compared to the most refined phonetic alphabet; and the tempered scale, to which the ordinary notation is adapted, to such a phonetic alphabet as can be practically used. But cases arise where the extended theory is the only one applicable, and these are the extremely common cases of unaccompanied singing, and double-stop passages on a violin, or quartets for stringed instruments. Confining myself to singing, I may observe that the ordinary notation of music presents great difficulties. Few singers learn to read from notes at sight. There are not many even professional singers perhaps, certainly there are next to no amateur singers, who would take a piece of music, written in any key or clef, and sing it at sight, either as it stands, or transposing it to another given pitch. This arises from the great number of different relations expressed by the same apparent intervals according to the prefixed signatures. But in singing, the singer requires to know the key-note, the relation of each note to the key-note, the change of key, and the value of the old scale in reference to the new. All this is so difficult for a beginner to decipher from the old notation, that it is as good as non-existent. To remedy

this inconvenience many expedients were tried, and the successful one is known as the Tonic Sol-fa system, with which Mr. Curwen's name has been so long and so honourably connected. This is totally different from the ordinary notation; but it teaches the thing music in a nearly perfect theory, it greatly facilitates learning to sing and the theoretical acquisition of harmony, and, strange to say, it renders singing from the old notation greatly more easy than before. When I showed Professor Helmholtz, whose musical discoveries have thrown an entirely new light on the subject, what young children in a British school could do by means of Tonic Sol-fa instruction, he acknowledged that there was no other system which could produce the same results. The success of Tonic Sol-fa-ists in examinations for theoretical music has been strongly marked. Now, what has been the result of this success? Simply this: The Society of Arts allows answers to questions on music to be given either in the established or in the Tonic Sol-fa notation. The Committee of Council on Education allows the teachers in subsidized schools to draw their fees for teaching music according to either the established or the Tonic Sol-fa notation. That is, these two bodies have admitted the two notations, so far, on an equal footing. That is, the Tonic Sol-fa-ist can succeed even without knowing the ordinary notation. That is, the Tonic Sol-fa notation is not looked on as an ignorant or fantastic method of writing music, but as a real power, possessing, so to speak, belligerent rights.

Why, then, should not a new system of spelling, possessing the advantages I have enumerated, also acquire belligerent rights and be regarded as a real power? Why should not the two bodies named, and after them other examining and official bodies, recognise a knowledge of the new spelling as sufficient qualification for a candidate? Why should not any one be ultimately able to use the new spelling on all occasions without losing caste? Would there be more difficulty than the double use of English and Welsh in Wales, where you see notices in both languages posted up, or of French and Flemish in Belgium, as is also seen? Nay, there would be much less, for every one would be able to read in both the old and new way. This is the ground on which I think that a concurrence of the old and a new spelling is not chimerical, and that, if a new spelling fulfilling the conditions I have sketched out could be devised, and be properly worked, the concurrence could be actually established. The steps of the process would be these:—

(1.) The invention of a spelling which would fulfil the specified conditions.

(2.) The proof that those conditions are fulfilled.

(3.) The construction of a double vocabulary, showing the correspondence of the two spellings, and serving the independent purposes of a pronouncing and a spelling dictionary.

(4.) The furnishing of a sufficient number of school-books for teaching to read the new, and from it the old, spelling.

(5.) The general employment of the new spelling to indicate pronunciation when required.

(6.) The habitual use of the new spelling by many persons, either from having been educated by its means, or from deliberate preference.

(7.) The recognition of the new spelling by examining bodies, and by government offices, as of equal value with the old.

This concurrence does not affect general printing any more than the Tonic Sol-fa system affects general musical publications. If, however, the new spelling reached the stage of government offices, it would probably become adopted even by several newspapers, and ultimately supersede the old. But these are questions for our grandchildren, and if they know nothing about them, the scheme, like so many others, will have failed.

This, then, is the object I have in view; part educational, part social, part scientific. This is the method by which I hope the spelling difficulty may be met. My theory is quite distinct from any peculiar form of practical realisation. But I should not have considered myself justified in occupying your time this evening if I had not a definite scheme to propose. The mode of writing to which I shall now draw your attention is a result of that long investigation of early English pronunciation to which I previously alluded, modified to suit the requirements of a general alphabet. As it will be convenient to give it a distinct name, to distinguish it from any other new spelling hitherto proposed, I will call it Glossic, from *γλῶσσα*, tongue; and for distinction, designate the customary orthography by the briefer term Nomic, from *νόμος*, custom.

The following are the principles of its construction:—

(1.) Glossic represents the sounds of words, and not their histories.

(2.) Glossic retains the Nomic letters now in use, with no addition, but completes the contrivance of using special combinations of letters to represent special sounds or combinations of sound.

(3.) No combination of letters in Glossic has more than one meaning under the same circumstances; and no combination of sounds has more than one Glossic representation.

(4.) In the representation of diphthongs regard has been paid to the great variety of existing uses, so that they are represented conventionally, and not analytically.

(5.) Provision has been made for the extension of Glossic to the writing of all our provincial dialects, and the full expression of all varieties of vowels and diphthongs, and also for an approximative or, if desired, accurate representation of such foreign names and words as are usually employed in English books and newspapers; including, therefore, the languages of the British dependencies, and of the countries with which they come into relation in all parts of the world.

(6.) The distinction between accented and unaccented syllables has been always indicated.

This last distinction is of great importance. The treatment of unaccented syllables in our language is quite peculiar to ourselves, so that, unless we introduce entirely new characters to represent sounds which have no analogue in other European languages, we cannot represent the values of our letters in unaccented syllables, without a convention that the absence of accent should indicate a change of meaning. In explaining the use of Glossic, therefore, the meaning of the letters in accented and unaccented syllables

must be considered separately. First, then, as regards accented syllables.

Our alphabet is usually assumed to consist of 26 letters, but there are at least 50 more well-established letters, or combinations of letters, due to various historical, or pseudo-historical, motives, having a more or less fixed value, together with numerous others which are too uncertain to be noticed. Of these the following 38 are suitable for Glossic:—*a aa ai au b ch d e ee ei eu g h i j k l m n ng o oa oi oo ou p r rr s sh t th u v w wh y z*, and require to be supplemented by three others, *dh zh* and *uo*. The following 38 must be either entirely rejected, or only used in that extension of Glossic to provincial and foreign sounds, which I have already mentioned, but which need not occupy us farther this evening:—*æ ao aw ay c ck ea eau eo ew ey gh gn ia ie ieu iew kh kn mn nh nk œ oe oeu ow oy ph pn q qu rh sch ue uoy uy wr x*. To these materials we must add the usual points, which will be found very serviceable.

The values of the old letters and combinations are readily determined. *Aa* has had its value in *baa* from the earliest times; *ee, oa, oo* were introduced in the sixteenth century, for the sounds in *beet, oar, cool; ai, au* have had the sounds in *bait, caul*, from the seventeenth century. These combinations can hardly suggest any other sounds. *I, c*, have sounded as in *knit, net*, from Anglo-Saxon times to the present day; the present values of *a, o, u*, in *gnat, not, nut*, date from the seventeenth century. The simple consonants *y, w, h; p b, t d, j, k g, f v, s z, l, m, n*, must be used as in *yea, way, hay; pea bee, toe doe, jest, keep gape, fie vie, seal zeal, lay may nay*. And no doubt can attach to the combinations *wh, ch, th, sh, ng*, in *whey, chest, thin, mesh, sing*.

The three new combinations, *dh zh* and *uo*, have to be used for sounds which have never received any special characters in English. The two first, *dh zh*, have been constantly employed by writers on sound, and present no difficulty. The analogies *t : d :: th : dh*, and *s : z :: sh : zh*, at once indicate their value. As *th*, therefore, represents the initial sound in *thin*, *dh* must represent that in *then*; and as *sh* represents the final sound in *rush*, *zh* must represent that in *rouge*. The short vowel represented by *u* in *full, bull, cushion*, by *o* in *woman, worsted, Worcester*, by *oo* in *cook, look, book, foot*, and by *ou* in *would, could, should*, has no present representative. And it could not be represented in Glossic by any one of these letters or combinations, because they are required for their more usual sounds in *nut, not, boot, bout*. There is no combination by which this sound has been exclusively represented in our language, since the time that the sound of *u* in *nut* became prevalent during the seventeenth century. Hence I propose to employ *uo* in this sense, as recalling all the four most usual signs *u, o, oo, ou*, and as having no other value hitherto attached to it in English.

There are still two difficulties to contend with. The letters used as parts of combinations have to be occasionally employed as separate letters with a distinct meaning, Thus *th* in *bother* and *boat-house*, *sh* in *meshes* and *mishap*, *ng* in *singing* and in *ingot*, &c., have very different meanings. We must, therefore, resort to the hyphen to separate the letters in the latter case.

The second difficulty relates to the peculiar double use of the letter *r* in English. When it precedes a vowel it is a mild, but may at pleasure be a strong trill, such as it always is in Scotch and Irish speech, whether before a vowel or not. The strongly trilled *r* is most suggestively symbolized by *r* followed by an apostrophe, as in *tur'n*, but the apostrophe may always be omitted when a vowel follows, except in elementary books. When, however, *r* does not come before a vowel, it sinks into a peculiar sound, which, without staying to analyze it, we may call vocal *r*. The proper sign for this will be *r* followed by a hyphen, as in *eer-aik = ear-ache*, but it need only be used before vowels, a simple *r* sufficing in other positions. Thirdly, when a word ending in vocal *r*, receives an inflectional syllable beginning with a vowel, a trilled *r* is interposed as in *hear, hearing*. In this case the full Glossic would require the hyphen after the first *r*, and the apostrophe after the second, as *heer-r'ing;* but as the first *r* does not, and the second *r* does, stand before a vowel, both the hyphen and apostrophe may be omitted by our former rules, and the result is simply *rr*, which must therefore always be written as in *heerring*. I may observe, that this tendency to add on a trilled *r* after a vocal *r* when a vowel follows, is precisely analogous to the tendency to add a *g* after *ng* in similar circumstances; compare *long, long-er*, meaning one who longs, and *long-ger*, meaning more long. Of course Glossic requires *ngg* in the last case, as it requires *rr* in the first.

But we have not yet done with the difficulties of the English vocal *r*. When it follows a vowel it forms a real diphthong with it, and modifies its sound. The principle of representing combinations of sounds by combinations of letters, enables us to avoid embarrassing analyses of shades of vowel sounds. We may, therefore, symbolize all these modifications by simply subjoining the vocal *r* to the vowel sign, interposing a hyphen if we wish to indicate the peculiarity of an absence of modification. The words *peer pair boar boor*, as compared with *peel pail pole pool*, or in Glossic *peer pair boar boor peel pail poal pool*, indicate some of these modifications. In *star starry*, Glossic *staar staarri*, the vocal *r* is frequently omitted in speech. The vowel has been constantly considered short by orthoëpists who insert the vocal *r*, and it really was short in speech so late as the sixteenth century, if not later. But it is advisable now to write the long sound of the vowel really used, and the vocal *r* must, till its absence is as much acknowledged as that of *l* in *talk*, be written in Glossic. The same remarks apply to *or* in *for, form*, which must have the long vowel *au* followed by vocal *r*, and, therefore, be written *faur, faurm*. The most peculiar modifications are those in such words as *sir, serve, absurd, word, work*. Some orthoëpists recognize two sounds in these words. If we include provincial varieties, three or four may be detected. I think one is enough to write, and I propose to employ *er* for this purpose, writing *ser, serv, aberd; werd, werk*. Hence *er*, when not before a vowel, or *er* with a hyphen after it, when a vowel follows, will always represent this peculiar English sound.

These considerations enable us to overcome the difficulties of English orthography for accented syllables to a far greater extent

than has yet been attempted with Roman letters, or their modifications, such as in the various phonetic alphabets in which books or passages have been printed during the last three hundred years, but of course excluding Mr. Melville Bell's Visible Speech, which has no Roman letters, and my own equally exact Palæotype, which uses a mixture of Roman, Italic, and small capital types. And this result is effected with a simplicity and suggestiveness which has not been hitherto attained, even for far less complete schemes of orthography.

A mark for stress is entirely new in English spelling. The modern Greek uses a mark in every word to indicate the position of an accent or stress, which is in every respect the same as our own, but the signs employed are those invented for an entirely different system of accentuation or vocal inflection, if we may credit the old grammarians, and are therefore unnecessarily complex. The Spanish is the only other modern European language which uses accent marks to indicate stress. In European languages generally, accent marks are simply diacritical. The Spanish Academy, while finding it necessary to indicate the position of the accent or stress in every word, wished to avoid a multiplicity of accent marks, and therefore laid down simple rules by which the reader could determine the position of the accent when it was not written. When I printed the Phonetic News, and other books in the same phonetic alphabet invented by Mr. Isaac Pitman and myself, I introduced similar rules; but as they were too complex they were practically disregarded by writers, and Mr. Isaac Pitman has long since abandoned them in print. The mode of pronouncing unaccented syllables in our language is, however, so different from the mode of pronouncing accented syllables, and the position of our accent is so capricious, that no system of phonetic writing is worth the labour bestowed upon it, which does not strictly determine the accented from the unaccented syllables. The sign of stress most convenient I have found to be a turned period or dot at the height of small letters and at the mid-height of capitals, placed immediately after a long vowel or diphthong, and immediately after the first consonant following a short vowel, in the accented syllable. For ordinary English Glossic, I adopt Mr. Melville's Bell's convenient rule, that the stress should be laid on the first syllable of a word, when not otherwise marked.

Unaccented syllables may be open or closed, and the closed may be liquid or stopped. In stopped accented syllables, that is, those which terminate with any consonant except vocal *r* and *l, m, n*, the unaccented vowel preserves the power it receives in accented syllables. Thus, in *maniac, except, hardship, gunshot, humbug, boathook*, the unaccented syllables *ac, ex, ship, shot, bug, hook*, are clearly and distinctly heard, and consequently occasion no difficulty. We write in Glossic, *mainiak, eksep't, haardship, gunshot, humbug, boat-huok*. But when the unaccented syllable presents a vocal *r*, or *l, m*, or *n*, after the vowel, the sound uttered is almost always obscure. We need not inquire very accurately into its nature or occasional differentiation. To mark its obscurity, I propose to follow the German custom, and use the vowel *e* only; writing *er, el, em, en*, and pronouncing obscurely. The following are examples of words which would have such a termination:—

husband, garland; reverend; tankard, dotard; attendance, pittance; cadence, negligence; tragical, chemical; shovel, cruel; Birmingham, Clapham; seldom, idiom; civilian; alien; mission, vacation; lemon, baron; solar, circular, pilfer, elixir, splendor, honour, liquor, sulphur; abundant, elegant; obedient, patient; and so on. Whatever may be the orthodox *view* of the pronunciation of these words, I do not think that much exception would be taken to the mode in which I have just pronounced them, and this is what *e* so placed will indicate in Glossic, when the words are written *huzbend, gaarlend; reverend; tankerd, doaterd; atew·dens, pitens; kaidens, neglijens; trajikel, kimikel; shuvel, krooel; Bermingem, Klapem; seldem, idiem; sivil·yen; alien; mishen, vakai·shen; lemen, baren; soaler, serkeuler, pilfer, ilik·ser, splender, oner, liker, sulfer.* If the *e* is distinctly pronounced, the syllable receives a secondary accent in speech, and the accent mark therefore secures the clear sound, as *rev·erew·d*, as distinct from *reverend.* Any other vowel but *e* would always be clearly uttered. In many syllables we acknowledge that a vocal *l, m, n* stands without a vowel, as in *able, rhythm, open.* Here no vowel need be written, and *l, m, n* will therefore rank as vowels except when preceding or following a vowel, or *l, r*; compare dissyllabic *aibl, rithm, oapn,* with monosyllabic *fauln, elm, term.* There remain the open short vowels. Of these *ai, aa, au, oa, oo* are very rare, and, when occurring, easily detected and properly written. As respects *ee,* almost all, if not all, writers of pronouncing dictionaries confuse it with the final vowel of *pity,* or rather consider the latter to be identical with the former. Long observation shows me that they are different, but true open short *ee* is, I think, rare; and short *ee,* in closed syllables, is unknown in English. I propose, therefore, to use open *i* as the short sound of *ee,* as well as its own; that is, I propose to eliminate short *ee* altogether from English pronunciation, except occasionally where the confusion might cause ambiguity, and the distinction is therefore made in speech, as in *immerge, emerge; dissent, descent;* in Glossic *imerj· eemerj·, disen't deesen't.* As to open *e,* there is a doubt whether it occurs, and I would confine its use to the case where *r* follows, because the customary sequence of *e, r* will suggest its true obscure value. The obscure sound of *a* in short open syllables, I would represent by *a,* as hitherto, except in the case of *e, r,* just mentioned. There is some doubt as to *o, u*; but I propose to employ *u* or *e,* in preference to *oa,* in those unaccented open syllables in which the sound is generally held to be an obscure *oa.* It would then not be necessary to use *u* or *uo* at all in open unaccented syllables.

As it would be frequently necessary to introduce Nomic in the midst of the Glossic words, and conversely to indicate for example the old forms of names, and also to show pronunciation, the simplest mode of pointing out the difference is to use *spaced letters* for the intruder, written by a wavy line drawn beneath the words. This is applicable to any kind of type which may be employed, even black letter, Egyptian capitals, and fancy forms. But on many occasions a simple change of type from Roman to Italic, or conversely, would suffice.

This brief and hurried account of the principles of Glossic writing will perhaps suffice to show you how easily it could be applied,

and what precise information it would give, in comparison with the present orthography. The key and example which I subjoin will make this arrangement clearer. Let me finally examine whether Glossic fulfils the conditions laid down as necessary for the admission of a concurrent system of spelling.

(1.) You will readily admit that you can read Glossic at least as easily as Spenser in his original spelling without instruction; and that in a few minutes you would read it even more easily, and with an appreciation of its value. Hence the Glossic writer would be immediately intelligible, and would have no need to learn the present spelling.

(2.) Glossic introduces no new types at all, and can be printed in any fount of type by any printer throughout the country. Posters could be immediately got out in it without difficulty.

(3.) Actual counting shows that the number of letters required for printing a page of English in Glossic is as nearly as possible the same as that required for ordinary spelling, notwithstanding the Glossic use of digraphs for long vowels and diphthongs, which are in Nomic often represented by single letters. This arises from the omission of mute letters, especially final *e,* and the second of doubled consonants. Where Latin words predominate, Nomic spelling is somewhat the briefer; where Saxon words are abundant, the advantage is on the side of Glossic. In the subjoined example, there are 2820 Glossic against 2796 ordinary letters.

(4.) Being phonetic, Glossic necessarily shows the nature of alphabetic writing; but as it uses digraphs, and distinguishes the value of letters in accented and unaccented syllables, it likewise shows how the symbolarium may be conveniently reduced without sacrificing certainty.

(5.) That any phonetic alphabet, such as Glossic, will materially facilitate reading in accordance with it, scarcely needs demonstration; but I have gathered great experience in proof of the practical value of phonetic spelling in this respect. The proper mode of using any phonetic system for young children, is to give them systematic exercises on the sounds of language before any letters are presented to them. They are then familiar with the things—dissected sounds and their composition—which are represented by separate letters and their combination, and consequently advance with extreme rapidity. A child thus taught ought to be able to read and write perfectly in Glossic at five years of age—that is, to be able to give the sound corresponding to any group of letters, and the group of letters corresponding to any sound, with absolute accuracy. He should continue to read in Glossic for at least a year, to fix a good pronunciation and acquire a knowledge of words in their true sounds, which most of our elementary school children would have no chance of hearing in conversation.

(6.) That reading Glossic will form an introduction to reading present spelling, there can be no doubt. It furnishes the reader with the principal regularities of our present spelling, and teaches him no value of any combination which he will have to unlearn. The Glossic reader is far more advanced than Sonnenschein and Meiklejohn's pupil before beginning their last course. The experience I have gathered from the use of my former alphabet, with 17 new letters, makes me speak with certainty on this point, pro-

vided the pupils are allowed to become thoroughly familiar with Glossic by many months' practice, so as to acquire a large stock of rightly pronounced words, and are not hurried into ordinary spelling for the glorification of the teacher, who is proud of having got them through so quickly, or to allay the ignorant impatience of parents, who cannot see the meaning of a preliminary process which they themselves never underwent.

(7.) Glossic will be as easy to write as it is for the pupil to acquire a received pronunciation. We know that the tendency of all half-taught writers is to adopt an unsystematised phonetic spelling. Here it would be systematised for them.

(8.) The experience gathered from the use of my former alphabet convinces me that a Glossic reader and writer will have less difficulty in learning the present spelling than one who has not been taught Glossic. The irregularities of the present spelling strike his eye at once, when he reads the present books. Still I should be as sorry for him to have that trouble as to be myself obliged to spell like Spenser. There is no doubt, however, that for some time to come, even if Glossic be adopted for concurrent use, as I have suggested, all clerks will have to go through the very unnecessary labour of learning to spell in our usual erratic manner.

(9.) The special advantages of Glossic in serving to settle orthoëpy, and hence rendering a received pronunciation accessible in every book, instead of being shut up in pronoüncing dictionaries, and the wonderful assistance it would be to foreigners, need no explanation. Its extension to embrace all spoken sounds meets a want which those only who have had to study provincial glossaries can properly appreciate. Even if Glossic were not adopted in elementary schools and for concurrent use, this glossarial application, for which it was originally intended, and for which I hope to use it in future investigations of the Comparative Phonology of English Dialects, will render it valuable to every student of our language. And its orthoëpical powers will render its use in advanced schools of great scholastic importance, as an instrument ready at hand, easily intelligible, and well adapted to train pupils in the pronunciation and enunciation of their own and other languages.

For these reasons I submit my scheme for your consideration, as one suitable to become a concurrent English orthography, fit to be admitted, when fully tested and worked out, on a par with the present spelling, first for educational and then for social use, offering all its advantages and almost none of its defects. It is on these two points in especial, that I wish to obtain the expression of your opinion in the ensuing discussion,—Will Glossic be useful as a school instrument to learn reading?—Will Glossic be useful in life as a substitute for learning to spell? If bodies like the College of Preceptors endorse the scheme as good and worthy to be tried, I hope publishers and schoolmasters may be induced to take it up. For myself, I am always ready to help; my sole aim and object in all the work I have hitherto undertaken in this direction having been, as I trust it will ever be, to assist in educating the English people.

Printed by C. F. Hodgson and Son, Gough Square, Fleet Street, E.C.

GLOSSIC.

By Alexander J. Ellis, F.R.S., F.S.A.

A NEW CONCURRENT SYSTEM OF SPELLING, INTENDED TO REMEDY THE DEFECTS, WITHOUT INTERFERING WITH THE USE, OF EXISTING ENGLISH ORTHOGRAPHY.

KEY TO ENGLISH GLOSSIC.

Read the large capital letters always in the senses they have in the following words, which are all in the usual spelling except the three underlined, meant for foot, then, rouge.

bEEt	bAIt	bAA	cAUl	cOAl	cOOl	
knIt	nEt	gnAt	nOt	nUt	fUOt	
hEIght	fOIl	fOUl	fEUd			
Yea	Way	WHey	Hay			
Pea	Bee	Toe	Doe	CHest	Jest	Keep	Gape
Fie	Vie	THin	DHen	Seal	Zeal	ruSH	rouZHe
eaR	R'ing	eaRR'ing	Lay	May	Nay	siNG	

R is vocal when no vowel follows, and modifies the preceding vowel, forming diphthongs, as in pEER, pAIR, bOAR, bOOR, hERb.

Use R for R', and RR for RR', when a vowel follows, except in elementary books, where *r'* is retained.

Separate *th, dh, sh, zh, ng* by a hyphen (-) when necessary.

Read a stress on the first syllable when not otherwise directed.

Mark stress by (·) after a long vowel or *ei, oi, ou, eu,* and after the first consonant following a short vowel.

Mark emphasis by (·) before a word.

Pronounce *el, em, en, er, ej, a,* obscurely, after the stress syllable.

When three or more letters come together of which the two *first* may form a digraph, read them as such.

Letters retain their usual names, and alphabetical arrangement.

Words in customary or NOMIC spelling occurring among GLOSSIC, and conversely, should be underlined with a wavy line ∼∼, and printed with spaist leterz, or else in a *different type.*

Spesimen ov Ingglish Glosik.

OBJEKTS.

Too fasil·itait Lerning too Reed.
Too maik Lerning too Spel unnes·eseri.
Too asim·ilait Reeding and Reiting too Heerring and Speeking.
Too maik dhi Risec·vd Proanunsiai·shen ov Ingglish akses·ibl too *aul* Reederz, Proavin·shel and Foren.

MEENZ.

Leev dhi Oald Speling untuch·t.
Introadeu·s along· seid ov dhi Oald Speling a Neu Aurthog·rafi, konsis·ting ov dhi Oald Leterz euzd invai·rriabli in dhair best noan sensez.
Emploi· dhi Neu Speling in Skoolz too Teech Reeding in *boath* Aurthog·rafiz.
Alou· eni Reiter too reit in dhi Neu Speling *oanli* on aul okai·zhenz, widhou·t loozing kaast, proavei·ded hee euzez a Risec·vd Proanunsiai·shen; dhat is—
Aknol·ej dhi Neu Speling konkur·entli with dhi Oald.

Nom·ik, (dhat iz, kustemeri Ingglish speling, soa kauld from dhi Greek *nom·os*, kustem,) konvai·z noa intimai·shen ov dhi risee·vd proanunsiai·shen ov eni werd. It iz konsikwentli veri difikelt too lern too reed, and stil moar difikelt too lern too reit.

Nomik buoks and paiperz aar dhi oanli egzis·ting meenz ov akwei·rring infermai·shen. Hens everi Ingglishmen must lern too *reed* nomik under pain ov rimai·ning ignerent.

Dhi oanli eus ov lerning too reit nomik iz too komeu·nikait widh dhoaz hoo reed nomik. If nomik reederz kan bee eekweli wel adres·t bei udher meenz, it wuod bee unnes·eseri too lern too *reit* nomik.

Dhi problemz ov reeding and reiting aar dhairfoar disting·kt.

Ingglish Glosik (soa kauld from dhi Greek *gloas·sa*, tung) konvai·z whotev·er proanunsiai·shen iz inten·ded bei dhi reiter. Glosik buoks kan dhairfoar bee maid too impaar·t risee·vd aurthoa·ipi too aul reederz. Bei simpl adish·enz it iz adap·ted, az British Glosik, too reit aul deialekts ov Ingglish and Skoch in wun alfabet, and, az Euniver·sel Glosik, too egzib·it dhi egzak·t proanunsiai·shen ov aul langgwejez. Noa neu leterz aar rikwei·rd in eni faurm ov Glosik.

Ingglish Glosik iz veri eezi too reed. Widh proper training, a cheild ov foar yeerz oald kan bee redili taut too giv dhi egzak·t sound ov eni glosik werd prizen·ted too him. Aafter hee haz akwei·rd familiar·iti widh glosik reeding hee kan lern nomik reeding aulmoast widhou·t instruk·shen. Dhi hoal teim rikwei·rd faur lerning *boath* glosik and nomik, iz not *haaf* dhat rikwei·rd faur lerning nomik aloa·n.

Glosik reiting iz akwei·rd in dhi proases ov glosik reeding. Eni wun hoo kan reed glosik, kan reit eni werd az wel az hee kan speek it, and dhi proper moad ov speeking iz lernt bei reeding glosik buoks. But oaing too its pikeu·lier konstruk·shen, glosik speling iz imee·dietli intel·ijibl, widhou·t a kee, too eni nomik reeder. Hens, a glosik reiter kan komeu·nikait widh *aul* reederz, whedher glosik aur nomik, and haz dhairfoar noa need too bikum·a nomik reiter. But hee kan bikum· wun, if serkemstensez render it dizei·rrabl, widh les trubl dhan dhoaz hoo hav not lernt glosik.

Dhi novelti ov dhi prezent skeem faur deeling widh dhi Speling Difikelti iz, that, wheil it maiks noa chainj in dhi habits ov egzis·ting reederz and reiterz, and graitli fasil·itaits lerning too reed our prezent buoks, it entei·rli obviaits dhi nises·iti ov lerning too reit in dhi euzheuel komplikaited fashen.

Dhis spesimen kontai·nz 2820 glosik, and wuod rikwei·r 2796 nomik, leterz. Glosik speling, dhairfoar, praktikeli taiks up dhi saim spais az nomik. Dhis arei·zez from dhi supresh·en ov aul meut leterz whotev·er. Auldhoa· dhi poazish·en ov dhi stres iz indikaited in eech ov dhi 559 werdz,, oanli 83 maarks ov stres, aur abou·t wun maark too sevn werdz, hav been found neseseri.

GLOSSIC.

By Alexander J. Ellis, F.R.S., F.S.A.

NEW CONCURRENT SYSTEM OF SPELLING, INTENDED TO REMEDY THE DEFECTS, WITHOUT INTERFERING WITH THE USE, OF EXISTING ENGLISH ORTHOGRAPHY.

KEY TO ENGLISH GLOSSIC.

Read the large capital letters always in the senses they have in the following words, which are all in the usual spelling except the three underlined, meant for foot, then, rouge.

bEEt	bAIt	bAA	cAUl	cOAl	cOOl
knIt	nEt	gnAt	nOt	nUt	fUOt
hEIght	fOIl	fOUl	fEUd		
Yea	Way	WHey	Hay		
Pea	Bee	Toe	Doe	CHest	Jest	Keep	Gape
Fie	Vie	THin	DHen	Seal	Zeal	ruSH	rouZHe
eaR	R'ing	eaRR'ing	Lay	May	Nay	siNG	

R is vocal when no vowel follows, and modifies the preceding vowel, forming diphthongs, as in pEER, pAIR, bOAR, bOOR, hERb.
Use R for R', and RR for RR', when a vowel follows, except in elementary books, where *r'* is retained.
Separate *th, dh, sh, zh, ng* by a hyphen (-) when necessary.
Read a stress on the first syllable when not otherwise directed.
Mark stress by (·) after a long vowel or *ei, oi, ou, eu*, and after the first consonant following a short vowel.

Mark emphasis by (·) before a word.
Pronounce *el, em, en, er, ej, a*, obscurely, after the stress syllable.
When three or more letters come together of which the two *first* may form a digraph, read them as such.
Letters retain their usual names, and alphabetical arrangement.
Words in customary or NOMIC spelling occurring among GLOSSIC, and conversely, should be underlined with a wavy line ~~~, and printed with spaist leterz, or else in a *different type*.

KEY TO UNIVERSAL GLOSSIC.

Small Capitals throughout indicate English Glossic.

"Visible Speech" Vowels.

Large capitals point out the most important additional vowel signs.

	Back.	Mixed.	Front.	Back.	Mixed.	Front.
	Primary.			*Wide.*		
High	uu'	ea	EE	U'	I'	I
Mid	UU	U	AI	AA	A'	E
Low	ua	ua'	AE	AH	E'	A
	Round.			*Wide*	*Round.*	
High	oo	ue'	ui	uo	uo'	UE
Mid	oa	oa'	EO	AO	ao'	OE
Low	au	au'	eo'	o	o'	oe'

A as in English *gnat*.
A' (read *ai-huok*) fine southern English *ask*, between *aa* and *e*.
AA as in English *baa*.
AE usual provincial English *e*, French *é*, German *ä*.
AH broad German *ah*, between *aa* & *au*.
AI as in English *bait*, with no after-sound of *ee*.
AO open Italian *o*, between *o* and *oa*.
ao' closer sound of *ao*, not quite *oa*.
AU as in English *caul*.
au' closer sound of *au*, as *i* in Irish *sir*.
E as in southern English *net*.
E' modification of *e* by vocal *r* in *herb*.
ea Russian ы, Polish *y*, variety of *ee*.
EE as in English *beet*.
EO close French *eu* in *peu, feu*.
eo' opener sound of *eo*, not quite *oe*.
I as in English knĭt.
I' opener sound of *i*, not quite *e*, as *e* in English *houses*, Welsh *u*.
O as in English not, opener than *au*.
o' a closer sound of *o*.
OA as in English *coal*, with no after-sound of *oo*.
oa' closer sound of *oa*.
OE open French *eu* in *veuf*, German ö.
oe' opener sound of *oe*.
OO as in English *cool*.

U as in English *nut*.
U' obscure *u*, as *o* in English *mention*.
ua open provincial variety of *u*.
ua' slightly closer *ua*.
UE French *u*, German *ü*.
ue' Swedish long *u*.
ui provincial German *ü*, nearly *ee*.
UO as in English *full*, *woman*, *book*.
uo' Swedish long *o*.
UU usual provincial variety of *u*.
uu' Gaelic sound of *ao* in *laogh*; try to pronounce *oo* with open lips.

QUANTITY OF VOWELS.

All vowels are to be read short, or medial, except otherwise marked.
The Stress (·) placed immediately after a vowel shews it to be long and accented, as *august*; placed immediately after a consonant, hyphen (-), gap (:), or stop (..), it shews that the preceding vowel is short and accented, as *augus·t*, *aamao:·*, *pa'pa'..*
The Holder (··) placed immediately after a vowel or consonant shews it to be long, as *au··gus·t*, *needl··*; the Stress Holder (···) shews that the consonant it follows, is held, the preceding vowel being short and accented, compare *hap'i*, *hap···i*, *ha·pi*, *ha·p···i*; only in theoretical writing.
Stop (..) subjoined to any letter indicates a caught-up, imperfect utterance, as *ka..*, *kat..* for *kat*; great abruptness is marked by (...)
Accent marks may also be used when preferred, being placed over the first letter of a combination, thus:
long, *áu* accented, *āu* unaccented.
short, *ŭ* accented, *ă* unaccented.
medial, *áa* accented, *āa* unaccented.
Ex. ăugŭst, āugùst, kiazāa, It. *casa*.

SYSTEMATIC DIPHTHONGS.

The stressless element of a diphthong is systematically indicated by a preceding turned comma (ʻ) called *hook*, as *m'eeaiee* It. miei, *Laa'ooraa* It. Laura, *p'aaoo'raa* It paura, *l'ueee* Fr. lui. But when, as is almost always the case, this element is *'ee* *'oo*, or *'ue*, it may be replaced by its related consonant *y*, *w* or *,w*, as *myaiy*, *Laavraa*, *l,wee*. Any obscure final element as *'u*, *'e*, *'ĕ*, is sufficiently expressed by the sign of simple voice *h'*, as provincial *neeh't* night, *streeh'm* stream *wih'kn* waken. In applying the rule for marking stress and quantity, treat the stressless element as a consonant.
The four English Glossic diphthongs EI, OI, OU, EU are unsystematic, and are variously pronounced, thus:
EI is *uy* in the South, sometimes *a'y*, *aay*; and is often broadened to *uuy*, *uhy*, *au'y*, in the provinces.
OI is *oy* in the South, and becomes *auy* provincially.
OU is *uw* in the South, sometimes *a'w* *aaw*, and is often broadened to *uuw*, *ahw*, *oaw*, *aow*; it becomes *oe,w* in Devonshire, and *aew* in Norfolk.
EU varies as *iw*, *eew*, *yoo*, *yiw*, *yeew*.
The Londoners often mispronounce AI as *ai'y*, *aiy*, *ey* or nearly *uy*, and OA as *oa'w*, *oaw*, *ow* or nearly *uw*.
English vocal R, is essentially the same as H', forming a diphthong with the preceding vowel. Thus English glossic *peer*, *pair*, *boar*, *boor*, *fer*, *difer·ring*, are systematic *pi·h'*, *pe·h'*, *bao·h'*, *buo·h'*, *fe·h'* or *fu·*, *dife·h'·ring* or *difu·ring*. But *r* is used where *r'*, or *rr'*, or *h'r'* may be occasionally heard.

CONSONANTS.

Differences from English Glossic consonants are marked by adding an *h* in the usual way, with *y'* for palatals, and *w'* for labials, by subjoining an apostrophe (') or by prefixing a turned comma (ʻ), a turned apostrophe (‸), or a simple comma (‚).

Simple consonants, and added G.

Y, W, H; P B, T D, J, K G, F V, S Z, vocal R, L M N, NG.

Added H.

WH, CH, TH DH, SH ZH.

KH, GH German *ch*, *g* in *Dach*, *Tage*; YH, R'H, LH, MH, NH, NGH are the hissed voiceless forms of *y*, *r'*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *ng*.

Added Y' and YH.

TY', DY', KY',GY', LY', NY', NGY', are palatalised or *mouillé* varieties of *t*, *d*, *k*, *g*, *l*, *n*, *ng*, as in *virtue*, *verdure*, old *eart*, old *guard*, Italian *gl*, *gn*, vulgar French, *il n'y a pas=ngy'aa pah*. LYH is the hissed voiceless form of LY'.
KYH, GYH are palatal varieties of KH, GH as in German *ich*, *fliege*.

Added W' and WH.

TW', DW', KW', GW', RW', R'W', LW', NW', &c., are labial varieties of *t*, *d*, *k*, *g*, *r*, *r'*, *l*, *n*, &c., produced by rounding the lips at or during their utterance, French *toi*, *dois*, English *quiet*, *guano*, *our*, French *roi*, *loi*, *noix*, &c.
KWH, GWH are labial varieties of KH, GH as in German *auch*, *saugen*, and Scotch *quh*. HWH is a whistle.

Added apostrophe (') *called "Hook."*

H' called *aich-hook*, is the simplest emission of voice; H'W' is *h'* with rounded lips; H'WH a voiced whistle.

T', D', called *tee-hook*, *dee-hook*, dental *t*, *d*, with tip of tongue nearly between teeth as for *th*, *dh*.
F', V', called *ef-hook*, *vee-hook*, toothless *f*, *v*, the lip not touching the teeth; *v'* is true German *w*.
R', or R before vowels, is trilled *r*.
N' read *en-hook*, French nasal *n*, which nasalizes the preceding vowel. To Englishmen the four French words *vent*, *vont*, *vin*, *un* sound *von'*, *voan'*, *van'*, *un'*; but Frenchmen take them as *vahn'*, *voan'*, *vaen'*, *oen'*. Sanscrit *unuswaa,ru*.
K', G' peculiar Picard varieties of *ky'*, *gy'*, nearly approaching *ch*, *j*.
CH', J', TS', DZ' monophthongal Roman varieties of *ch*, *j*, *ts*, *dz*.
T'H, D'H lisped varieties of *s*, *z*, imitating *th*, *dh*; occasional Spanish *z*, *d*.
S' not after *t*, Sanscrit *visu,rgu*.

Prefixed comma (‚), *called "Comma."*

‚H read *koma-aich*, lax utterance, opposed to ‚H.
‚T ‚D read *koma-tee*, *koma-dee* peculiar Sardinian varieties of *t*, *d*, the tongue being much retracted.
‚L Polish barred *l*, with ‚LH its voiceless, ‚LW' its labial. and ‚LWH its voiceless labial forms.
‚ read *hamza*, check of the glottis.

Prefixed turned comma (ʻ), *called "Hook."*

ʻ read *ein*, the Arabic *'aayn* or bleat.
ʻH, ʻT ʻD, ʻS ʻZ, ʻK, read *huok-aich*, *huok-tee*, &c.; peculiar Arabic varieties of *h*, *t*, *d*, *s*, *z*, *k*; ʻG the voiced form of ʻK.
ʻKH, ʻGH, called *huok-kai-aich*, *huok-jee-aich*; the Arabic *kh*, *gh* pronounced with a rattle of the uvula.
ʻW, ʻPR, ʻBR, read *huok-dubl-eu*, &c.; lip trills, the first with tight and the others with loose lips; the first is the common English defective *w* for *r'*, as *ve'wi i'veoo*, the last is used for stopping horses in Germany.
ʻR read *huok-aar*, the French *r grasseyé*, and Northumberland burr or *k'ruop* =*'gh*; ʻRH its voiceless form.
ʻLH, ʻL, read *huok-el-aich*, *huok-el*, Welsh *ll*, and its voiced Manx form.
ʻF, ʻV, read *huok-ef* &c.; *f*, *v* with back of tongue raised as for *oo*.

Prefixed turned apostrophe (‸), *called "Curve."*

‸AA, read *kerv-aa*, an *aa* pronounced through the nose, as in many parts of Germany and America, different from *aan'*, and so for *any* vowel, *'h*, or *h'*.

ʻT ʻD, ‸SH, ‸R, ‸L, ‸N read *kerv-tee* &c., Sanscrit "cerebral" *t*, *d*, *sh*, *r'*, *l*, *n*; produced by turning the under part of the tongue to the roof of the mouth and attempting to utter *t*, *d*, *sh*, *r'*, *l*, *n*.
‸H read *kerv-aich*, a post aspiration, consisting of the emphatic utterance of the following vowel, in one syllable with the consonant, or an emphatically added final aspirate after a consonant. Common in Irish-English, and Hindoostaanee.
‸W is the consonant related to *ue*, as *w* is to *oo*.

Clicks,—spoken with suction stopped.

C, tongue in *t* position, English *tut*!
Q, tongue in ‚t position.
X, tongue in *ty* position, but unilateral, that is, with the left edge clinging to the palate, and the right free, as in English clicking to a horse. *C*, *q*, *x*, are used in Appleyard's *Caffre*.
QC, tongue in *ty* position, but not unilateral; from Boyce's *Hottentot*.
KC, tongue retracted to the *'k* position and clinging to the soft palate.

Whispers or Flats.

°H, called *serkl-aich*, simple whisper;
°H' whisper and voice together
ᶜH' diphthongal form of °*h*'.
°AA, read *serkl-aa*, whispered *aa*, and so for all vowels.
°B, °D, read *serkl-bee* etc., the sound of *b*, *d*, heard when whispering, as distinct from *p*, *t*, common in Saxony when initial, and sounding to Englishmen like *p*, *t* when standing for *b*, *d*, and like *b*, *d* when standing for *p*, *t*. °G, whispered *g*, does not occur in Saxony.
°V, °DH, °Z, °ZH, °L, °M, °N read *serkl-vee* etc., similar theoretical English varieties, final, or interposed between voiced and voiceless letters.

TONES.

The tones should be placed after the Chinese word or the English syllable to which they refer. They are here, for convenience, printed over or under the vowel *o*, but in writing and printing the vowel should be cut out.
o̍, *o̍* high or low level tone, *p'hing̍*.
ó, *ó* tone rising from high or low pitch, *shaanǵ*.
ô, *o̖* rise and fall, (that is, *foo-kyen shaang̖*,) or fall and rise.
ò, *o̗* falling tone to high or low pitch, *kyoo̗* or *k'hoe̗*.
ŏ, *o̘* sudden catch of the voice at a high or low pitch, *shoo̘*, *zhe̘*, *ngyip̘*, or *yaap̘*.

Signs.

Hyphen (-), used to separate combinations, as in *mis-hap*, *in-got*. In *whair-ever*, *r* is vocal; *elm faulu* are monosyllables, *el-m*, *faul-n* are dissyllables; *fidler* has two syllables, *fidl-er* three syllables.

Divider), occasionally used to assist the reader by separating to the eye, words not separated to the ear, as *tel)er dhat)l doo*.

Omission (‸), occasionally used to assist the reader by indicating the omission of some letters usually pronounced, as *hee)‸l doo)‸t*.

Gap (:) indicates an hiatus.

Closure (.) prefixed to any letter indicates a very emphatic utterance as *mei .hei* for *my eye*.

Emphasis (ˈ) prefixed to a word, shews that the whole word is more emphatically uttered, as *ei ˈneu dhat ˈdhat dhat ˈdhat man sed woz rong ; ˈei gaiv ˈtoo thingz too ˈtoo men, and ˈhee gaiv ˈtoo, ˈtoo, too ˈtoo, ˈtoo.*

The following are subjoined to indicate, ı emission, ¡ suction, ¿ trill of the organs implicated, † inner and ‡ outer position of the organs implicated, ‡ tongue protruded, § unilaterality, • linking of the two letters between which it stands to form a third sound.

EXAMPLES.

Received Pronunciation.—Whot doo eu wont? *Vulgar Cockney.*—Wau·chi wau·nt? *Devonshire.*—Wat d)yue want? *Fifeshire.*—Whuu't u'r' yi' waan;n? *Teviotdale.*—Kwhaht er' ee wahntun? *Teviotdale.*—Dhe)r' ti'wkwh sahkwhs graow·un e dhe Ri'wkwh Hi'wkwh Hahwkwh.—Kwhaht er' ee ahnd um? U')m ahnd um naokwht.—Yuuw un ·mey el gu'ng aowr' dhe deyk un puuw e pey e dhe·muunth e Mai·y.—Hey)l bey aowr' dhe ·naow nuuw.

Aberdeen.—Faat foa·r' di'd dhe peer' si'n vreet tl)z mi'dher'?

Glasgow.—Wu)l ait wur' bred n buu;ur' doon dhu waa;ur'.

Lothian.—Mahh' koanshuns¡ hahng u' Be·yli!—Gaang u'wah·, laadi! gai·tu dhu hoar's, sai xx! un shoo em ·baak ugi'n·!

Norfolk.—Wuuy dao·nt yu' paa·)mi dhaat dhur ·tue paewnd yu' ao·)mi, bo? Uuy dao·nt ao·)yu' nao ·tue paewnd. Yuuw ·due!

French.—Ai p‿wee uen vyaiy ka·raony' ai un'n)on'fon' bao·rny' oan' von'due doo moavae van' oa poeplh bae··t. Ee aet voo?

German.—Ahkh! aaymu' aayntseegyhu' ue·blu' foyreegyhu' mueku' koentu' v'oal ahwkwh meekyh boe·zu' mahkhu'n! Yhah·szoa·! Es too·t meer' oon:en·dleekyh laayt!

Arabic Alphabet, (*substituting hamza for ;aalef.*) ; b t th j ʿh ʿkh d dh r' z s sh ʿs ʿd ʿt ʿz ʿ ʿgh f ʿk k l m n w y.

Arabic vowel system after F. W. Newman—

fine e ae, i ee, uo oo, aiy oaw.
coarse u aa, ue uey, oe oew, aay aaw.

Sanscrit Alphabet, (*modern pronunciation, the vowels* aa, ee, oo, ai, oa, *being always long*; aa *is often replaced by* ah *or* ar..)

u aa, i ee, uo oo; ai ei, oa ou, n' s',
k k‿h g g‿h ng, ch ch‿h j j‿h ny', ‿ṭ ‿ṭh ‿ḍ ‿ḍh ‿n, t t‿h d d‿h n,
p p‿h b b‿h m, y ‿r l v, sh ‿sh s h ‿l.

Hindoostaanee, (*after Monier Williams, where* aa *may be* ah *or* au.)

Alphabet. : aa ai b ch d ‿d ee ei f g ʿgh h ‿h i j k ʿk ʿkh l m n n' oa oo ou p r' ‿r s sh t ‿t u uo v w y z.

Anecdote (*the position of the accent is not marked because not assigned by Monier Williams*). Aik shuʿkhs b‿hook‿haa ʿKaazee kai yuhaan' gu-yaa kuhnai lugaa: Mein' b‿hook‿haa huon', kuch‿h muoj‿h-ai doa; toa mein' k‿hr‿aoon'! ʿKaazee nai kuhaa ki yih ʿKaazee kaa g‿hur' hei, ʿkusuı k‿haa, our' chulaa jaa.

*** *Communications on Pronunciation solicited by the Author*, 25, *Argyll Road, Kensington, London, W.*

26404

END OF
TITLE